



Indiana Pro Bono Commission
One Indiana Square, Suite 530
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Indiana Bar Foundation
230 East Ohio Street, Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204

COMBINED 2005 DISTRICT REPORT, 2007 PRO BONO GRANT APPLICATION, AND 2007 PLAN

Pro Bono District 14

Applicant: AMY W. ROTH

Mailing Address: 1307 EAST ELM STREET

City: NEW ALBANY, IN Zip: 47150

Phone: 812-949-2292 Fax: 812-945-5787

E-mail address: probono14@sbcglobal.net

Judicial Appointee: J. TERRENCE CODY

Plan Administrator: AMY WESTON ROTH (60% TIME)

Names of Counties served: CLARK, CRAWFORD, FLOYD, HARRISON, ORANGE,
SCOTT, WASHINGTON

Percentage of volunteer attorneys (as defined on page 3) who accepted a pro bono case in 2005 per registered attorneys in district, i.e. the district's pro bono participation rate 20.6%
To the extent the pro bono participation rate information is available by county, please provide below. (These are attorneys, not the # of cases: Clark, 17.1; Craw., 0; Floyd, 16.9; Harrison, .6; Orange, .8, Scott, 13.3; Wash., 26.3)

Number of potential clients requesting help in 2005 (limit this to actual intake done or sessions in which plan administrator or his/her delegate provided more than minimal assistance): 417

Amount of grant received for 2006: \$17,000

Amount of grant (2006 & prior years) projected to be unused as of 12/31/06: 0

Amount requested for 2007: \$89,500

One supplemental, explanatory page may be added to the end of this report and plan.

2007 PLAN SUMMARY

1. Please write a brief summary of the 2007 grant request. Please include information regarding your district's planned activities including committee meetings, training, attorney recognition, newspaper or magazine articles, marketing and promotion. The grant request should cover needs to be addressed, methods, target audience, anticipated outcomes, and how past difficulties will be addressed.

- **Our plans and goals for 2007 are ambitious!** Some of them are recycled old goals, set aside because of the lack of money resources and time to further them; others are new ones, spurred by the perceived need in the district as the program matures. In order to implement these goals, the Plan Administrator must be full time, with a part-time assistant acting as gatekeeper, phone answerer, front-line screener of applications, doer of internal system housekeeping—and in general freeing the Administrator to act as a manager and not as a clerk. All our goals will involve meetings, training, marketing via whatever means are feasible, and whatever our target market for the various means, **our real target is that of doing our job—helping low income people get the legal help they need.** Any coordination effort with other agencies that makes this job easier will be explored.
- **This district is finally ready** to make clinics a reality and not a mere idea, and there is strong board and judicial support for this particular effort. →We need to participate in Talk to A Lawyer; →we have strong interest from several of the courts in setting up pro se clinics; →we have support for “pre-educating” potential pro se clients in a group setting→there is strong interest in implementing an ADR program for pro se clients in coordination with a clinic. These will all be done, or at least started, in 2007.
- **On the “housekeeping” side,** →we want to work toward a smoother integration of automated intake with referral documents, a process already started by web gurus at the state level. →We need to implement an efficient and systematic monitoring program for open cases—this has languished because of lack of time. →We want to monitor more effectively new attorneys in the district and get them involved, with mentors if possible.
- **The Plan Administrator** needs to travel to all counties in the district, with point people set up in the outlying counties (our most populous and active counties are Floyd and Clark) and work with point people in larger law firms in any county.
- **Training:** →It's time for another CLE, and not only a regular CLE but “mini” ones in conjunction with group meetings, such as a Bar Association or Inn of Court meeting—that foundation has been laid with the Floyd County Bar Association. →And, we need a periodic “boot camp” for attorneys dealing with pro bono clients; some of our attorneys have a hard time getting their minds around the different techniques needed in working with indigent people who are not paying. **We will help our attorneys more.**
- **We have made good strides** in collaboration efforts with various social service agencies; these will be further nurtured. However, we will also work for better coordination with libraries (educate the resource people there—many clients depend on those facilities for computer access) and banks, one of which has already agreed to do credit/debt counseling for our program.
- **Legal Volunteers** has been, in the slim times in which we have operated, building infrastructure with networking, reaching out to other organizations, and learning how best to take care of our attorneys. Our main difficulties have been not only dealing with a very slim budget, but also with defining the way program can be developed within the given parameters to serve the needs of District 14 best. This is an ongoing process, **but it is now time to move ahead;** there is much to do, and many areas to be explored with the help of as many resources as we can muster. **It will be an exciting year!**

2005 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY CASES IN DISTRICT __14__

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 3A. Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer attorney column but complete one line for each pro bono case for that attorney.

Definitions

Case: A legal matter referred to and accepted by a pro bono attorney volunteer. This includes mediation and GAL services.

Volunteer Attorney: An attorney who has rendered pro bono service to at least one low-income client during the year or accepted a pro bono referral from the identified program. This does not include attorneys who are on the list of pro bono volunteers but who have never taken a case. The case numbers do not include cases screened, only cases actually referred to a pro bono attorney. This also includes an attorney who has worked solely on a pending pro bono case that was neither opened nor closed during the reporting year.

Case Type: Please use the abbreviations listed in Indiana Supreme Court Administrative Rule 8(B)(3) or any other defined abbreviation.

Name of Pro Bono Provider (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): LEGAL VOLUNTEERS

IOLTA funding accounts for _50% (2005) (59%-2006) of total pro bono provider budget. Please state the percentage of volunteers and cases which are attributable to IOLTA funding _50% 2005_. If this percentage is substantially more than the percentage of IOLTA funding, please explain.

| Volunteer Attorney Name | County OF CASE | Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2005 | Number of cases closed in 2005 | Number of cases pending in 2005 that were neither opened nor closed in 2005 | Number of hours for cases closed in 2005 (column 4) | Case Type |
|-------------------------|------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|------------------------|
| Graham | Clark | | 1 | | 4 | Misc |
| Lowe, R | " | | 1 | | 2 | Adopt |
| Robison | " | | 1 | | 15 | Div |
| Welch | " | | 1 | | 5 | Div |
| " | Fl | 1 | | 1 | | Div |
| Schad, M | Clark | | 1 | | 15 | Cust/sup |
| " (silent partner) | Cl | 1 | 1 | | 4 | Div |
| Fondrisi | Cl | | 1 | | 15 | Div |
| " | Cl | | 1 | | 10 | Bk |
| " | Floyd | | | 1 | 14 | Div |
| " | Cl | 1 | 1 | | 12 | Patern |
| Smith, W.E. III | Clark | | 1 | | 4 | Div |
| " | Fl | 1 | 1 | | 8 | Bk |
| TOTAL: 74 | <i>No total needed</i> | TOTAL: 77 | TOTAL: 97 | TOTAL: 13 | TOTAL: 894 | <i>No total needed</i> |

Name of Pro Bono Provider (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): LEGAL VOLUNTEERS

2005 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY LIMITED INFORMATION ACTIVITY IN DISTRICT 14

This limited legal information chart can include activities such as pro se clinics and call-in or walk-in informational services.

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 4A.

Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer attorney column but complete one line for each type of legal information activity for that attorney.

Name of Pro Bono Provider (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): LEGAL VOLUNTEERS

| Volunteer Attorney Name | County | Type of Activity | Number of Hours |
|---|--------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| J. Mark Robinson | All | Debt Counseling | 60 |
| John Brengle | All | Debt Counseling | 75 |
| Marianne J. Conrad | All | Debt Counseling | 45 |
| Greg Neely | Floyd | Brief Service (in office) | 10 |
| Karen Goodwell | Wash. | Brief Service (in office) | 2 |
| Michael Ward | Floyd | Brief Service in office | 2 |
| Gregory M. Neely | Floyd | Brief Service in office | 2 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL: 7 | | | TOTAL: 196 |
| OVERALL VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY TOTAL: 81 | | | OVERALL HOURS TOTAL: 1090 |

2005 REPORT

Please list your District's 2005 activities--including committee meetings, training, attorney recognition, newspaper or magazine articles, marketing and promotion--in chronological order.

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Activity</u> |
|--------------------|------------------------|
|--------------------|------------------------|

- | | |
|--|--|
| | • January 12: Floyd County Bar Association Meeting |
| | • January 25: Legal Volunteers Board Meeting |
| | • February 18: Family Law Training, ILS office, Indianapolis |
| | • March 15: Floyd County Bar Association Meeting |
| | • April 13: Initial meeting with ICADV and other agencies to start planning LAV Grant Application—Indy |
| | • May 11: Second meeting with LAV Grant task force—Indy |
| | • May 17: Legal Volunteers Board Meeting |
| | • June 1: Lunch with Legal Volunteers board member to plan community education campaign |
| | • June 7: Meeting at Monica's office re: LAV task force; lunch with Monica to plot strategy |
| | • July 1: Lunch with another board member to plan community initiative |
| | • July 6: Lunch with local DV director to plan collaboration effort |
| | • July 20: LAV task force full meeting--Indy |
| | • July 21: Meeting with two attorneys and Clark County judge to plan ADR pro bono procedure for pro se divorces. |
| | • July 26: Breakfast with Board member (DV advocate) to discuss our work in Harrison/Crawford Counties. |
| | • July 26: Legal Volunteers Board Meeting |
| | • July 28: LAV Sub-committee conference call |
| | • August 3: LAV committee conference call |
| | • August 24: Article about District 13 in Pro Bono Supplement to the Indiana Lawyer |
| | • September 27: Legal Volunteers Board Meeting |
| | • September 28: LAV sub-committee conference call—canceled last minute |
| | • October 6: Breakfast with two board members—planning meeting |
| | • October 7: LAV Committee meeting at ICADV office in Indy—9 a.m. |
| | • November 15: Legal Volunteers Board Meeting |
| | • November 16: Floyd County Bar Association Meeting |
| | • November 23: Floyd/Clark Task Force on Domestic Violence meeting—Clarksville |
| | • November 30: LAV Sub-Committee in Indy |
| | • December 12: LAV Committee meeting—Indy |
| | • Winter, 2005/2006: Article featuring District 14 in Dialogue, from the Division of Legal Services of the ABA. |

2005 REPORT

Please provide a short summary of how the provision of pro bono service is coordinated in your district, including the intake process, the relationships of pro bono providers in the district, how referrals are made, and how reporting is done.

Our intakes are processed by the submission of written applications only. While we get a high percentage of referrals from ILS (using their own application forms), the rest come from various social service agencies, including the local homeless shelter and the domestic violence shelter and advocates in various counties. All these latter have copies of the Legal Volunteers application (similar to the ILS intake form), plus the Legal Volunteers application is on the state web site with an easy-to-use URL. The clients mail in the applications for processing. Since ILS is the only other pro bono legal provider in the district, referrals from them plus occasional consultations together about clients are the only screening mechanism available to us in the legal field; the major agencies providing clients know our guidelines and do a good amount of pre-screening. If the client's legal needs are unclear and they are having difficulties setting priorities, they are referred out for a "Brief Service" consultation with an attorney, with no commitment from the attorney to go on record with the case.

"Easy" cases, e.g., uncontested guardianships, are referred without consultation with the attorney, but most of our cases in the domestic violence area are pre-qualified with an attorney before referring. Occasionally a referral is mailed with a simultaneous email to the attorney explaining why the client was accepted by the program and adding any details not contained in the application. Clients who are rejected get a prompt note to that effect; if an existing pro se form is appropriate, **and** if the Plan Administrator deems that the clients are capable of using it, they are either directed to the proper place on the web site or sent a hard copy of the necessary forms and instructions.

Referral paperwork to the attorney is a complete packet containing a copy of the intake, a copy of the retainer, a copy of the referral letter to the client, and two forms to be returned: one is an initial disposition form on which the attorney either accepts or rejects the case and signs that he/she is in good standing in the state of Indiana; the other is a closing form for reporting outcome and number of hours when the case closes. These hours are recorded when received.

Time has not permitted extensive monitoring of cases, and there are some minor holes in the infrastructure, but we believe that the referral process is by and large a sound one.

Please describe any special circumstances, including difficulties encountered, affecting your District's 2005 implementation of its plan.

The major problem has been, as always, lack of money to implement the necessary and desired activities and the plans we have no problem formulating. In 2005, the Plan Administrator worked 80% time, and made a concerted effort to educate the local referring agencies as well as to collaborate with them on the monitoring and screening of clients. Clinics have been a hard sell in this District, but with the changes in the Rules of Professional Conduct, that attitude is softening, and there is some movement now in that direction. There is a special need for pro se clinics, and the courts have expressed concern over the increasing numbers of pro se divorce filings and really want to streamline this process.

Our CLE at the end of 2004 yielded several new pro bono signups, who were really helpful in the family law areas in 2005. However, while we received a very small bankruptcy grant from the American College of Bankruptcy, the "market" for pro bono bankruptcies virtually dried up when the rules changed in September and providing that service became more difficult for attorneys. Those attorneys who had "dabbled" in bankruptcies previously now flatly refuse to do them, and even the "specialists" say that they cannot afford to do them for free. We have spent our grant money by paying half filing fee for selected clients, but cannot help any further at this point.

We are still having a hard time getting our board to enter fully into the process and to coordinate to be actively involved. Attendance is poor, and while they are full of ideas on such matters as fund-raising, the ideas do not come to fruition.

Budget Narrative

Please provide descriptions of the following line items in the foregoing budget chart, by item number, in the space provided. Please explain any other budget entries that are not self-explanatory, including other sources of income.

Lines (A)(1), (2), (3), (4) Please indicate the number of hours per week for each personnel position, rate of pay, and all employee benefits.

__ (B)(1) Plan Administrator will be paid for full time work at \$25 per hour, with no benefits.

__ (2) Assistant will be paid for 60% time work at \$10.50 per hour, no benefits

PLEASE NOTE: AT THE END OF 2006, VIRTUALLY ALL OUR MONIES WILL BE EXPENDED, LEAVING ONLY ENOUGH OF A "PAD" TO MEET THE FIRST 2007 PAYROLL ON JANUARY 5, 2007.

Line (C)(1) Please describe the occupancy cost in terms of square footage, utilities or other amenities and indicate whether the occupancy cost is above or below the market rate for that space.

__ (C)(1) We are told that the going rate for a suitable office for two people in this area is \$400-600 per month or more. We are currently renting a small office in a church (strictly for one person) for \$50 per month but must move in several months.

Line __ (C)(3) __

Legal Volunteers will need to purchase a computer and printer sometime in the very near future.

The one we have now is almost four years old and was not purchased for the "work horse" duty that is demanded.

(C)(8) The malpractice insurance was paid twice (on paper) in 2005 because of the underwriting cycle. The original negotiations for the insurance were not concluded in time for the premium to be paid in 2004. It was actually paid in January of 2005, but the renewal was processed late in 2005 and payment demanded then as a condition of binding the policy for 2006. This will even out in the future.

(C)(14) Limited funds for litigation expenses have come from county-specific grant monies, which are almost exhausted; we would like to have this area part of our operating budget.

((E) This ending budget balance contemplates being able to meet the first payroll of the new year before the IOLTA check is received.

| |
|---|
| ANNUAL TIMETABLE FOR SUBMISSION OF FORMS AND CHECKS: |
|---|

| | |
|-------------|---|
| January 1: | Checks distributed |
| July 1: | Annual report, plan and grant application due to IPBC |
| November: | Notification of awards |
| December 1: | IBF grant agreement due and revised budget due |

The following representations, made to the best of our knowledge and belief, are being provided to the Indiana Pro Bono Commission and Indiana Bar Foundation in anticipation of their review and evaluation of our funding request and our commitment and value to our Pro Bono District.

Operation under Rule 6.6

In submitting this application for funding, this district is representing itself as having a Pro Bono Plan, which is pursuant to **Rule 6.6** of the Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct. The plan enables attorneys in our district to discharge their professional responsibilities to provide civil legal pro bono services; improves the overall delivery of civil legal services to persons of limited means by facilitating the integration and coordination of services provided by pro bono organizations and other legal assistance organizations in our district; and ensures access to high quality and timely pro bono civil legal services for persons of limited means by (1) fostering the development of new civil legal pro bono programs where needed and (2) supporting and improving the quality of existing civil legal pro bono programs. The plan also fosters the growth of a public service culture within the district which values civil legal pro bono publico service and promotes the ongoing development of financial and other resources for civil legal pro bono organizations.

We have adhered to **Rule 6.6** (f) by having a district pro bono committee composed of:

- A. the judge designated by the Supreme Court to preside;
- B. to the extent feasible, one or more representatives from each voluntary bar association in the district, one representative from each pro bono and legal assistance provider in the district, and one representative from each law school in the district; and
- C. at least two (2) community-at-large representatives, one of whom shall be a present or past recipient of pro bono publico legal services.

We have determined the governance of our district pro bono committee as well as the terms of service of our members. Replacement and succession members are appointed by the judge designated by the Supreme Court.

Pursuant to **Rule 6.6** (g) to ensure an active and effective district pro bono program, we:

- A. prepare in written form, on an annual basis, a district pro bono plan, including any county sub-plans if appropriate, after evaluating the needs of the district and making a determination of presently available pro bono services;
- B. select and employ a plan administrator to provide the necessary coordination and administrative support for the district pro bono committee;
- C. implement the district pro bono plan and monitor its results; and
- D. submit an annual report to the Commission.

Commitment to Pro Bono Program Excellence

We also understand that ultimately the measure of success for a civil legal services program, whether a staffed or volunteer attorney program, is the outcomes achieved for clients, and the relationship of these outcomes to clients' most critical legal needs. We agree to strive for the following hallmarks which are characteristics enhancing a pro bono program's ability to succeed in providing effective services addressing clients' critical needs.

1. Participation by the local bar associations and attorneys. The associations and attorneys believe the program is necessary and beneficial.

2. Centrality of client needs. The mission of the program is to provide high quality free civil legal services to low-income persons through volunteer attorneys. Client needs drive the program, balanced by the nature and quantity of resources available.

3. Program priorities. The program engages in a priority-setting process, which determines what types of problems the program will address. Resources are allocated to matters of greatest impact on the client and are susceptible to civil legal resolution. The program calls on civil legal providers and other programs serving low-income people to assist in this process.

4. Direct representation component. The core of the program is direct representation in which volunteer attorneys engage in advocacy on behalf of low-income persons. Adjunct programs such as advice clinics, pro se clinics and paralegal assistance are dictated by client needs and support the core program.

5. Coordination with state and local civil legal providers and bar associations. The programs work cooperatively with the local civil legal providers. The partnerships between the civil legal providers and the local bar association results in a variety of benefits including sharing of expertise, coordination of services, and creative solutions to problems faced by the client community.

6. Accountability. The program has mechanisms for evaluating the quality of service it provides. It expects and obtains reporting from participating attorneys concerning the progress/outcome of referred cases. It has the capability to demonstrate compliance with requirements imposed by its funding source(s), and it has a grievance procedure for the internal resolution of disputes between attorneys and clients.

7. Continuity. The program has a form of governance, which ensures the program will survive changes in bar leadership, and has operational guidelines, which enable the program to survive a change in staff.

8. Cost-effectiveness. The program maximizes the level of high quality civil legal services it provides in relationship to the total amount of funding received.

9. Minimization of barriers. The program addresses in a deliberate manner linguistic, sensory, physical and cultural barriers to clients' ability to receive services from the program. The program does not create undue administrative barriers to client access.

10. Understanding of ethical considerations. The program operates in a way which is consistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct; client confidentiality is assured and conflicts of interest are avoided. The staff and volunteers are respectful of clients and sensitive to their needs.

11. ABA Standards. The program is designed to be as consistent with the ABA Standards for Programs Providing Civil Pro Bono Legal Services to Persons of Limited Means as possible.

No events, shortages or irregularities have occurred and no facts have been discovered which would make the financial statements provided to you materially inaccurate or misleading. To our knowledge there is nothing reflecting unfavorably upon the honesty or integrity of members of our organization. We have accounted for all known or anticipated operating revenue and expense in preparing our funding request.

We agree to provide human-interest stories promoting Pro Bono activities in a timely manner upon request of the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission. We further agree to make ourselves available to meet with the Pro Bono Commission and/or the Indiana Bar Foundation to answer any questions or provide any material requested which serves as verification/source documentation for the submitted information.

Explanation of items stricken from the above Letter of Representation:

It is understood that this Letter does not replace the Grant Agreement or other documents required by the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission.

Signatures:

Judicial Appointee Signature

Date

Plan Administrator Signature

Date

BUDGETS for 2005, 2006 and 2007

| Income Category | 2005 Actual Income | 2005 Budget | 2006 Actual Income To Date | 2006 Budget | 2007 Budget |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| A. INCOME | | | | | |
| 1. IOLTA Grant Amount | \$17,000.00 | \$17,000.00 | \$17,000.00 | \$17,000.00 | \$89,500.00 |
| Other Income: <i>Explain source(s) and if Actual/Expected in narrative</i> | | | | | |
| 2.Private Foundation | \$2,000.00 | | | \$2,000.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| 3.Donations | | \$750.00 | \$750.00 | \$0.00 | \$700.00 |
| 4.Interest from Fiduciary (to offset C-16) | \$303.24 | \$0.00 | \$108.39 | \$0.00 | \$307.00 |
| 5. Total Income (sum of lines A1 - A4) | \$19,303.24 | \$17,750.00 | \$17,858.39 | \$19,000.00 | \$91,507.00 |
| Expense Category | 2005 Actual Expenditures | 2005 Budget | 2006 Actual Expenditures To Date | 2006 Budget | 2007 Budget |
| B. PERSONNEL EXPENSES | | | | | |
| 1. Plan Administrator | \$25,956.00 | \$23,000.00 | \$10,074.00 | \$21,000.00 | \$52,000.00 |
| 2. Paralegals | | | | | |
| 3. Others - Please explain Ass't | | | | | \$13,104.00 |
| 4. Employee benefits | | | | | |
| a. Insurance | | | | | |
| b. Retirement plans | | | | | |
| c. Other - Please explain FICA | \$1,986.00 | \$1,760.00 | \$771.00 | \$1,606.50 | \$4,980.47 |
| 5. Total Personnel Expenses (sum of lines B1 - B4c) | \$27,942.00 | \$24,760.00 | \$10,845.00 | \$22,606.50 | \$70,084.47 |
| C. NON-PERSONNEL EXPENSES | | | | | |
| 1. Occupancy | \$600.00 | \$600.00 | \$300.00 | \$400.00 | \$6,000.00 |
| 2. Equipment Rental | | | | | |
| 3. Office Supplies (Includes Postage) | \$922.00 | \$300.00 | \$63.00 | \$200.00 | \$4,000.00 |
| 4. Telephone (Includes Email) | \$1,231.00 | \$1,350.00 | \$578.00 | \$700.00 | \$1,300.00 |
| 5. Travel | \$721.00 | \$250.00 | \$171.00 | \$150.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| 6. Training | \$18.00 | \$200.00 | \$0.00 | \$50.00 | \$100.00 |
| 7. Library | | | | | |
| 8. Malpractice Insurance | \$2,183.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$500.00 | \$1,200.00 |
| 9. Dues and Fees | \$35.00 | \$50.00 | \$0.00 | \$50.00 | \$50.00 |
| 10. Contingent Reserve | \$0.00 | \$500.00 | \$0.00 | \$300.00 | \$500.00 |
| 11. Litigation Reserve | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 12. Marketing and promotion | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$500.00 |
| 13. Attorney recognition | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,500.00 |
| 14. Litigation Expenses | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,000.00 |
| 15. Property Acquisition | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 16. Contract Services (Fiduciary fees) | \$999.82 | \$340.00 | \$340.00 | \$340.00 | \$1,640.00 |
| 17. Grants to other pro bono providers | <u>\$0.00</u> | <u>\$0.00</u> | <u>\$0.00</u> | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 18. Other - Please explain | | | | | |
| 19. Total Non-Personnel Expenditures (sum of lines C1 - C18) | \$6,709.82 | \$3,590.00 | \$1,452.00 | \$2,690.00 | \$18,790.00 |
| D. TOTAL EXPENDITURES (sum of B5 & C19) | \$34,651.82 | \$28,350.00 | \$12,297.00 | \$25,296.50 | \$88,874.47 |
| E. ENDING FUND BALANCE (A5 less D) | -\$15,348.58 | -\$10,600.00 | \$5,561.39 | -\$6,296.50 | \$2,632.53 |

IOLTA funding accounts for 50 % of total pro bono provider budget. Please state the percentage of volunteers and cases which are attributable to IOLTA funding 50. If this percentage is substantially more than the percentage of IOLTA funding, please explain.

| Volunteer Attorney Name | County OF CASE | Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2005 | Number of cases closed in 2005 | Number of cases pending in 2005 that were neither opened nor closed in 2005 | Number of Hours for cases closed in 2005 (column 4) | Case Type |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|-----------|
| Ward | FI | 1 | 1 | | 7 | Gu |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 5 | Gu |
| “ | CI | | 1 | | 5 | Gu |
| “ | Floyd | | 1 | | 4 | Will/Est |
| Price | Clark | | 1 | | 10 | Gu |
| Fox | CI | 1 | 1 | | 15 | Div |
| Cummins | Clark | 1 | | | | Div |
| M. Naville | CI | 1 | 1 | | 8 | Gu |
| Forsee | CI | 1 | 1 | | 5 | Div |
| Thompson, P | Harr | 1 | 1 | | 8 | Gu |
| Bertrand | CI | 1 | 1 | | 30 | Div |
| “ | CI | 1 | | | | Div |
| Briscoe | CI | 1 | 1 | | 60 | Div |
| Goodwell | CI | 1 | 1 | | 9 | Gu |
| Thomas, T. | CI | 1 | | | | Cust |
| Williams, J. | CI | 1 | 1 | | 10 | Non-pro |
| “ | Floyd | | | 1 | | Real Est |
| Fowler | Floyd | 1 | Atty.died | | 7 | Div |
| “ (another atty Finished case) | Wash | | “ | 1 | 5 | Div |
| Dawkins | Clark | 1 | | | | Div |
| T. Naville | CI | 1 | 1 | | 5 | Gu |
| “ | CI | 1 | 1 | | 2 | Gu |
| Reger, G. | CI | 1 | 1 | | 1 | Br. Ser |
| “ | FI | 1 | | | | Home |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 3 | BS |
| Ingle | Harr | 1 | 1 | | 8 | Gu |

| Volunteer Attorney Name | County OF CASE | Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2005 | Number of cases closed in 2005 | Number of cases pending in 2005 that were neither opened nor closed in 2005 | Number of Hours for cases closed in 2005 (column 4) | Case Type |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------|
| Hamilton, RP | Harr | 1 | 1 | | 8 | BK |
| “ | FI | | 1 | | 15 | Bk |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 8 | Bk |
| “ | CI | 1 | | | | Bk |
| Neely | CI | 1 | 1 | | 2 | Br. Ser |
| Ulrich | CI | 1 | | | | Div |
| Vandewater | Scott | | 1 | | 10 | Div |
| Thomas, S. | CI | 1 | 1 | | 8 | Pat |
| “ | Floyd | | 1 | | 37 | Div |
| “ | FI | | 1 | | 27 | Cust |
| Voelker | Clark | 1 | | | | Pat |
| “ | FI | | 1 | | 15 | Div |
| Murphy | CI | 1 | | 2 | | L/T |
| Bartlett | CI | 1 | | 1 | | Will |
| Adams | CI | 1 | | 1 | | Supp |
| Conrad, M. | CI | 1 | | | | Div |
| “ | Floyd | | 1 | | 10 | Div |
| Carmichael | FI | | 1 | | 16 | Div |
| Fox | FI | | 1 | | 6.5 | Div |
| Sinex | FI | | 1 | | 4 | Will/est |
| Smith, E.W. | FI | | 2 | | 2 | POA |
| Deatrlick | FI | | 1 | | 3 | Br. Ser |
| Rush | Harr | 1 | | | | L/T |
| “ | FI | | | 1 | | Cust |
| Cooper | CI | | 1 | | 10 | Div |

| Volunteer Attorney Name | County OF CASE | Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2005 | Number of cases closed in 2005 | Number of cases pending in 2005 that were neither opened nor closed in 2005 | Number of Hours for cases closed in 2005 (column 4) | Case Type |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| Conrad, K. | FI | | 1 | | 1 | Cust |
| “ | FI | | 1 | | 1 | Cust |
| “ | Harr | 1 | 1 | | 1 | Cust |
| Reger, L | FI | | 1 | | 24 | Div |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 3.5 | Br. Ser. |
| “ | Orange | 1 | | | | Supp |
| Lohmeyer | FI | | 1 | | 9.5 | Cust |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 8 | Bk |
| Renfro | FI | | 1 | | 4 | Grandp |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 2 | Div Br.S |
| Glickfield | FI | | | 1 | | Cust. |
| Eichenberger | FI | | 1 | | 2 | POA |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 2 | POA |
| Swarens | FI | | 1 | | 4 | Gu |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 4 | Gu |
| “ | Crawford | 1 | 1 | | 15 | Div |
| Palmquist | FI | | | 1 | | Div |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 15 | Gu |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 2 | Home |
| Grannan | FI | | 1 | | 15 | Div |
| “ | FI | 1 | | | | Patern |
| “ | FI | 1 | | | | Supp |
| Stiller | FI | 1 | 1 | | 4 | Gu |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 4 | Br.Ser. |
| Isom | Orange | 1 | | | | Patern |

| Volunteer Attorney Name | County OF CASE | Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2005 | Number of cases closed in 2005 | Number of cases pending in 2005 that were neither opened nor closed in 2005 | Number of Hours for cases closed in 2005 (column 4) | Case Type |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|----------------|
| Schad, L. | Floyd | | | 1 | | Pat |
| Mattox | FI | 1 | 1 | | 12 | Div |
| Lorch | FI | 1 | 1 | | 5 | Cust |
| “ | | 1 | | 1 | | Div |
| Neely | FI | 1 | 1 | | 3 | BS |
| “ | Wash | | 1 | | 1 | BS |
| Bourne | FI | 1 | 1 | | 4 | Gu |
| Howard | FI | 1 | 1 | | 12 | Cust |
| Carmichael | FI | 1 | | | | Div |
| | | | | | | |
| Weber | FI | 1 | | | | Gu |
| “ | FI | 1 | 1 | | 25 | Div |
| Brown | Scott | | 1 | | 15 | Div |
| Hamilton, RG | Wash | | 1 | | 10 | Div |
| Scifres | Wash | | 1 | | 20 | Non-Pro |
| Dietrich | Scott | | 1 | | 18 | Div |
| “ | Scott | 1 | 1 | | 18 | Cust |
| Austin | Harr | | 1 | | 12 | Div |
| “ | Wash | | 1 | | 4 | Will |
| “ | CI | 1 | 1 | | 25 | Div |
| DeSimone | Wash | | 1 | | 22 | Cust |
| “ | Wash | 1 | 1 | | 14 | Gu |
| Bartanen | Wash | | 1 | | 4 | L/T |
| Woodard | Wash | | 1 | | 8 | Supp |
| “ | Clark | 1 | | | | Div |

[illegible]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION REGARDING DISTRICT 14 AND LEGAL VOLUNTEERS

[Please note: on the statistics pages, the cases are listed by the county of the case, not the county of the attorney. We believe this gives a better picture of the distribution of cases over the district.]

- Legal Volunteers has come a long way in five years! While Indiana Legal Services' office in New Albany handled the pro bono coordination work on a very part-time basis after Rule 6.5 went into effect, it was not until mid-2001 that the program achieved a more independent role with the hiring of a Plan Administrator. Even so, the office remained in the ILS "home" and all the money was funneled through the ILS accounting system. In the initial year and a half of existence, the basic infrastructure was set up, a computer was purchased, decisions were made about procedures, and an excellent referral process was refined. At that point, all the applications and referrals were coming from ILS. It was not until two years ago, when the office and money were moved away from that venue, that applications began coming from other sources, and a strong coordination effort with other agencies was begun. This movement has increased steadily, and now the majority of our applications come from outside the ILS referral process.
- From the beginning, Legal Volunteers has existed under the handicap of low community identity; branch offices of the same bigger law firms in Louisville which strongly support Louisville Legal Aid have either given us nothing or a pittance. We have continued to exist mainly on IOLTA money and a Venture Grant from Metro United Way—a one-time award—plus a grant from the Caesars Foundation 2 ½ years ago—money given only for new projects. It is obviously impossible to develop new projects when the pressing need is to continue the old one, not to mention that preparing grant applications is very difficult for a part-time employee who does everything.
- At this point, five years after the first PA was hired, we have an independent office, independent money, malpractice insurance for our attorneys, and are in the process of getting our 501(c)(3). Our application is on the state web site, a major accomplishment, and a huge time and postage saver. We are gaining community identity, and our PA is on a local task force to fight domestic violence—she also participated in the state task force, spearheaded by ICADV, to apply for a large federal grant for the state work against domestic violence; we are working with the courts to coordinate efforts in several areas, such as pro se clinics, mediation using ADR funds, CLEs, and recruitment of attorneys. We are working on a plan to identify and recruit new attorneys in our various communities and arrange for them to have mentors on pro bono cases.
- **DISTRICT 14 IS ON THE MOVE!!**